

**Karen Nel, B. Tech**  
**\*Kim Greaves, BSc, MD**

\*Poole Hospital NHS Foundation Trust  
and Bournemouth University  
Department of Cardiology  
Longfleet Road  
BH15 2JB Poole, Dorset  
United Kingdom  
E-mail: kim.greaves@poole.nhs.uk

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2013.04.077>

## REFERENCES

1. Naya M, Murthy V, Foster C, et al. Prognostic interplay of coronary artery calcification and underlying vascular dysfunction in patients with suspected coronary artery disease. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2013;61:2098–106.
2. Vasu S, Bandettini P, Hsu L, et al. Regadenoson is a better myocardial vasodilator than dipyridamole in normal volunteers, but the data is less compelling in patients (abstr). *J Cardiovasc Magn Reson* 2011;13 Suppl 1:P124.
3. Tadamura E, Iida H, Matsumoto K, et al. Comparison of myocardial blood flow during dobutamine-atropine infusion with that after dipyridamole administration in normal men. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2001;37:130–6.
4. Rossen J, Quillen J, Lopez A, et al. Comparison of coronary vasodilation with intravenous dipyridamole and adenosine. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1991;18:485–91.

## Reply

## All Vasodilators Are Not Equal

We appreciate the commentary by Ms. Nel and Greaves regarding our study (1). Previous studies have demonstrated that dipyridamole, regadenoson, and adenosine all achieve maximal coronary hyperemic flow via endothelial-independent vasodilation of the microvasculature (2–4). Although dobutamine stress has a different mechanism of action, the resulting hyperemia is similar in magnitude to adenosine (5). More important, in both the larger cohort from which this study was derived (6) and in other large cohorts (7), the stressor used was not informative to the multivariable model for predicting cardiac events. Accordingly, we do not believe that the use of multiple stress agents is likely to have resulted in a type 1 error or a false-positive association between CFR and outcomes.

In response to concerns raised by Nel and Greaves regarding incorporation bias, this problem occurs in diagnostic studies in which the test being evaluated is available to referring clinicians, and thus, may influence the diagnostic endpoint. In our study of prognosis, CFR was not available to referring clinicians, and consequently, could not have influenced clinical decision making. Furthermore, the clinical endpoints were adjudicated blinded to CFR values. Finally, for inclusion in this study, normal PET myocardial perfusion imaging was defined not on the basis of CFR, but rather on semiquantitative interpretation of myocardial perfusion scans.

**Masanao Naya, MD, PhD**  
**Venkatesh L. Murthy, MD, PhD**  
**\*Marcelo F. Di Carli, MD**

\*Brigham and Women's Hospital  
ASB L1-037C  
75 Francis Street  
Boston, Massachusetts 02115  
E-mail: mdicarli@partners.org

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2013.05.037>

## REFERENCES

1. Naya M, Murthy V, Foster C, et al. Prognostic interplay of coronary artery calcification and underlying vascular dysfunction in patients with suspected coronary artery disease. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2013;61:2098–106.
2. Rossen JD, Quillen JE, Lopez AG, Stenberg RG, Talman CL, Winniford MD. Comparison of coronary vasodilation with intravenous dipyridamole and adenosine. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 1991;18:485–91.
3. Lieu HD, Shryock JC, von Mering GO, et al. Regadenoson, a selective A2A adenosine receptor agonist, causes dose-dependent increases in coronary blood flow velocity in humans. *J Nuclear Cardiol* 2007;14:514–20.
4. Goudarzi B, Fukushima K, Bravo P, Merrill J, Bengel FM. Comparison of the myocardial blood flow response to regadenoson and dipyridamole: a quantitative analysis in patients referred for clinical 82Rb myocardial perfusion PET. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging* 2011;38:1908–16.
5. Bartunek J, Wijns W, Heyndrickx GR, de Bruyne B. Effects of dobutamine on coronary stenosis physiology and morphology: comparison with intracoronary adenosine. *Circulation* 1999;100:243–9.
6. Murthy VL, Naya M, Foster CR, et al. Improved cardiac risk assessment with noninvasive measures of coronary flow reserve. *Circulation* 2011;124:2215–24.
7. Panza JA, Holly TA, Asch FM, et al. Inducible myocardial ischemia and outcomes in patients with coronary artery disease and left ventricular dysfunction. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2013;61:1860–70.

## A Randomized Comparison of Pulmonary Vein Isolation With Versus Without Concomitant Renal Artery Denervation in Patients With Refractory Symptomatic Atrial Fibrillation and Resistant Hypertension

With the advent of renal artery denervation, numerous publications have been forthcoming. Previously, we petitioned the *Journal* as well as other publications about the lack of citation of our earlier studies (1–6) using intravascular electrode catheters to ablate autonomic nerves on the outside of blood vessels. We can appreciate the reluctance of the *Journal* to include these citations at that time based on the difference between the intravascular ablation of nerves in the renal arteries affecting blood pressure (7,8) rather than intravascular ablation of nerves outside of blood vessels affecting heart rate and cardiac arrhythmias (9). However, recent reports have documented the consistent and independent effects of renal sympathetic denervation (RSD) on heart rate reduction (10,11). More conclusive evidence supporting our contention is based on the experimental studies of Zhao et al. (12) and the recent clinical study by Pokushalov et al. (13), which have shown that RSD can be used to reduce the